



not inherently refer to inner surfaces as asserted by Applicant. Examiner Crowell asserted that claim 1 also includes outer surfaces of the side walls being substantially tangent to outer surfaces of the cylindrical regions even though the outer surfaces do not define the inner volume.

Applicant and Examiner Crowell further discussed the rejection of claim 1 in view U. S. Patent No. 5,730,801 (*Tepman, et al.*), alone and in combination with other references. Applicant submitted that no reference teaches an inner volume as defined by Applicant since the volume defined by the inner walls is not taught, shown, or suggested by any reference of record. Examiner Crowell concluded that claim 1 is not limited to the internal volume asserted by Applicant because claim 1 includes an internal volume of any shape as long as the outer surfaces have the substantially tangent relationship recited in claim 1.

Applicant asked whether revision of claim 1 to refer to inner surfaces of the substantially cylindrical regions and inner surfaces of the side walls to define the inner volume would be considered a new issue. Examiner Crowell responded that such an amendment would be a new issue requiring an RCE since the revision would not be based on inherency as asserted by Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd., Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)